DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 151 JC 900 541

TITLE Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP): Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines.
INSTITUTION San Diego Community Coll. District, Calif.
PUB DATE 29 Jan 90
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Contracts; *Employment Practices; Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Development; *Faculty Promotion; Negotiation Agreements; *Personnel Policy; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Salaries; Tenure; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Since July 1, 1985, all new faculty appointed to tenure-track positions in the San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) have been subject to a promotion process which has been modified twice in the past 2 years. In addition, a new evaluation procedure and instrument have been adopted, and a competitive "Merit Step Advancement" feature has been added to the district-faculty collective bargaining agreement. This faculty handbook was developed by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) in order to familiarize faculty and administrators with current procedures regarding the awarding of tenure, evaluation, and promotion, An introductory letter to all faculty describes the background to the handbook, stresses that the purpose of evaluation is to foster professional growth, and offers suggestions on the records that should be kept by faculty seeking promotion. The three-part handbook presents the revised guidelines by contrasting them with the wording of the superseded version. Section one describes the standards for regular promotion, discussing process and policies. Section two reviews the standards, application procedure, and review process for merit step advancement. The final section describes tenure and promotion procedures, reviewing probation and tenure, post-tenure, non-promotional evaluation, general promotion procedures from assistant to associate to full professor, promotion timelines, CAP promotional decisions, and notification of promotion. (GFW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325151

Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. P. Gallego

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC900541

Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines

January 29, 1990

San Diego Community College District
3375 Camino del Rio South, San Diego, CA 92108

DATE: January 29, 1990

TO: All College Faculty

FROM: Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Guidelines for Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion (Revised)

Since July 1, 1985, all new faculty appointed to tenure-track positions in the San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) have been subject to a promotional process which has been modified twice in the past two years. In addition, a new evaluation procedure and instrument have been adopted, and a competitive "Merit Step Advancement" feature has been added to the District-Faculty collective bargaining agreement. Since all of the above are still in their infancy, and since future modifications remain a possibility, it is essential that all faculty and administrators familiarize themselves with the current procedures regarding the awarding of tenure, evaluation, and promotion. The best place to start is by reading the attached *Tenure, Evaluation and Promotion: A Handbook for Faculty*, prepared by the Committee on Academic Personnel. The Handbook was issued first on October 5, 1989. In the process of implementing the *Handbook*'s procedures and in reviewing comments and criticisms by faculty and administrators, it was apparent that some revision was in order. This second printing of the *Handbook* is the result of that revision. Please note that all deletions are printed in the "Strikeout" mode, while all additions are underlined.

There are several important points which must be stressed at the outset:
--The major aim of evaluation should remain always to foster professional growth and teaching excellence;
--Although the SDCCD's new evaluation instruments, both peer and student, are to be used in evaluating all faculty, the results will be utilized for promotional purposes ONLY for those tenure-track and tenured faculty hired after July 1, 1985, and for any tenure-track or tenured faculty applying for a Merit Step Advancement.

We also would like to offer some suggestions to those who must or who choose to undergo promotional review. Be certain to keep complete records of any and all evidence of professional and/or scholarly accomplishments. This collection should include records of: (a) all education pursued and/or completed since initial appointment; (b) all teaching materials; (c) any and all appropriate professional experience, such as papers presented, guest lectures given, publications, awards, conferences attended, etc.; (d) all "District Service," such as committee participation; (e) "collegial contacts" outside of your College; (f) participation in professional organizations; (g) attendance at "in-service"-type workshops; and, (h) curriculum development efforts.

You might also want to document (in whatever way you find appropriate) that you have read professional journals, new studies, etc., and have otherwise made efforts to stay current in your field; and that you have an awareness of different "instructional techniques," a familiarity with the relevant entry and course requirements of our primary transfer institutions (SDSU and UCSD); and a familiarity with appropriate "ancillary services" on campus (learning lab, library, etc.).

Hopefully, all this will make more sense after you have read the Handbook. If you have any questions, please feel free to call any member of the Committee on Academic Personnel, whose names, campuses, office numbers, and phone numbers are listed ~~below~~ on the following page.

Chancellor's Chair:	A. P. Gallego, Director, Instructional/Student Services Stadium Plaza 584-6939
Mesa President:	Yvonne Bergland, Dean - Health and Natural Science 560-2803
City President:	Marvin Burdg Dean of Instruction 230-2523
Miramar President:	James Cargill, Professor of Diesel Technology 693-6856
Mesa Faculty Senate:	Charles Zappia, Associate Professor of History 560-2845
City Faculty Senate:	Douglas Dailard Professor of Art 230-2596
Miramar Faculty Senate:	Raymond McFarlane, Professor of Fire Science 693-6821
AFT:	John Markley, Professor of English, City College 230-2553

TENURE, EVALUATION, AND PROMOTION: A HANDBOOK FOR FACULTY

Decisions regarding tenure and promotion are made jointly by the faculty and administration, consistent with state law (particularly AB 1725), collective bargaining agreement, District policies and procedures, and Faculty Senate action.

(a) The California Education Code has empowered Community College faculty with far greater rights and responsibilities regarding the tenuring of their probationary colleagues, and the evaluation of all faculty and administrators (AB 1725, Sections 27, 29, 36, 38-51).

(b) According to AB 1725, full-time probationary faculty must be evaluated at least once each academic year, tenured faculty must be evaluated at least once every three years, and adjunct faculty must be evaluated within their first year and at least once every six semesters thereafter. Peer review must be the most important component of the evaluation process, and student evaluation should play a role as well. Since AB 1725 in no way diminishes the scope of collective bargaining, evaluation procedures, including those applied to probationary faculty, are still subject to negotiation; however, the faculty's exclusive representative shall consult with the appropriate academic senates prior to collective bargaining on evaluation procedures.

(c) The probationary period will remain at two years for those faculty hired prior to July 1, 1990. After that date, the probationary period for gaining tenure will extend from two to four years (dependent upon the appropriation of at least another $70 million dollars of program improvement money).

(d) In the case of the San Diego Community Colleges, the above-noted provisions of state law relate to, at least by implication, the promotional structure outlined in the College Faculty Bargaining Agreement (Article VIII - Salary, Section A4.10):

(e) The major District-wide policy committee and review body for all decisions regarding appointment and promotion is the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The Committee is comprised of seven members, one each appointed by the three Faculty senates, one each appointed by the three College presidents, and one appointed by the Faculty's exclusive bargaining representative. The CAP is chaired by a separate designee of the Chancellor (Bargaining Agreement, Article VIII - Salary, Sections A6.0, A6.1).

(f) The revised College Faculty Bargaining Agreement, effective July 1, 1989, established the following duties for the Committee on Academic Personnel (Article VIII - Salary, Section A6.2):

A6.2 Responsibilities

The Committee shall have the following responsibilities and others as may be assigned by the Board of Trustees or the Chancellor:

A6.2.1 Develop standards for the appointment and promotion of contract faculty consistent with District policies and procedures.

A6.2.2 Recommend rank *and step** for vacant contract positions.

A6.2.3. Review and recommend to the Chancellor faculty nominated for promotion.

(g) The CAP met weekly throughout the academic year 1988-89, researched the various issues, and prepared a report which was disseminated to the Chancellor's cabinet and to the three College Faculty Senates, first in preliminary draft form in December, 1988, and then in final draft form in May, 1989. After considering and responding to input from faculty and administration, the final CAP report was submitted to and approved by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees on September 27, 1989 and approved on October 11, 1989. What follows is a ~~synopsis~~ January 1990 revision of that report's guidelines on promotion, evaluation, and appropriate procedures.

*** "*and step*" eliminated by contract change effective 7/1/89.**

1.0 STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION

1.1 Regular Promotion: Process

NOTE: The promotional process outlined below applies ONLY to those faculty hired on or after July 1, 1985; Section A4.10.4 of the current bargaining agreement exempts all faculty hired prior to July 1, 1985 from the regular promotional process. SUCH FACULTY WILL ADVANCE UP THE STEP LADDER AUTOMATICALLY, WITHOUT THE REQUIREMENT OF PROMOTIONAL REVIEW.

Regarding regular promotion through the ranks of the faculty, Section A4.10.2 of the College Faculty Bargaining Agreement (effective July 1, 1989) empowers campus committees appointed by the Academic Senates to review and act upon regular promotions of faculty from the top step of Assistant Professor to the first step of Associate Professor. The committees' recommendations will be forwarded to the appropriate campus President who may accept or reject the committee's decision. Whenever a President reverses a Senate committee's decision on promotion, the faculty member will be able to appeal that decision to the CAP. Regarding promotion to the rank of Professor, Section A4.10.3 stipulates:

"Each year the colleges through their C.A.P. representatives shall recommend the number of promotions from the top step of Associate Professor Rank to the Professor Rank. The C.A.P. shall review these and present their joint recommendations via the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees. The Board shall accept the recommendations or return these to the C.A.P. for further review."

The procedure outlined in the bargaining agreement relates to the yearly determination of the number of possible promotions only. Regarding the question of who will review the records of individual faculty eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor, the CAP agreed that the professional goals of the District would be served best if the Committee were to delegate the responsibility of initial review to Faculty Senate-appointed committees of full Professors on each of the campuses. The process, effective September 11, 1989, will be like that described in Section A4.10.2 of the Bargaining Agreement for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, with one exception. Again, the campus committees would forward their recommendations to the appropriate President who would either accept or reject them; however, the CAP will review all Professorial promotions. Please refer to Section 3.0 below for more detailed information.

1.2 Regular Promotion: Standards and Policies

(1) It should be expected that if hiring committees are careful in their screening and recommendations, and if faculty and administrators are serious about tenure review, then most tenured faculty will advance ultimately to the rank of Professor, providing they meet required performance standards.

(2) Budgetary constraints should not be permitted to influence in any direct way the process of promotion. The aim of peer evaluation and promotional review should remain always to foster professional growth and teaching excellence.

(3) An Assistant Professor should be competent to teach in a particular field, should be current in the literature of that field, and should seek to meet student needs in both the classroom and in non-classroom environments. However, an Assistant may be a junior member of the academic community, with little professional and/or teaching experience. It further should be expected that an Assistant may have little experience in curriculum development, committee work, governance, professional and/or community service, etc. Thus the Assistant Professor generally will be new to college teaching, especially tenure-track college teaching, and should be willing to learn from his/her senior colleagues.

(4) For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, the candidate must show evidence that he/she has grown professionally and consistently has sought to meet student needs, in both the classroom and in non-classroom environments. An Associate Professor will have remained current in the field, may have completed additional appropriate coursework (if applicable), may have attended professional conferences, may have served on campus and/or District committees, may have produced some creative work, and should have improved his/her teaching in some demonstrable way. "Proof" of professional growth should be drawn from a careful analysis of student evaluations and peer evaluations over a period of time, and from a critical reading of materials submitted by the candidate.

(5) For promotion from Associate to Professor, the candidate must show evidence that he/she has grown professionally to a point where he/she has mastered both a particular field of knowledge and the teaching of that knowledge. Again, a candidate must show evidence that he/she consistently has sought to meet student needs, in both the classroom and non-classroom environments. A Professor should be a senior member of the faculty, one who has such substantial experience, knowledge, and skill that he/she could mentor junior faculty in his/her area of expertise. A Professor will have demonstrated all the same kinds of achievements and attributes necessary for promotion to the Associate Professor rank, but in addition will demonstrate that he/she is a leader in some appropriate sense. "Proof" of professional growth and leadership should be drawn from a careful analysis of student evaluations and peer evaluations over a period of time, and from a critical reading of materials submitted by the candidate.

2.0 MERIT STEP ADVANCEMENT

Section A4.11 of the College Faculty Bargaining Agreement allows any tenured or tenure-track faculty member to apply for a Merit Step Advancement "which shall be one step on the salary schedule and effective at the beginning of the next academic year" (A4.11.2). Section A4.11.1 stipulates that the CAP will develop the standards for merit step advancement and implies that the CAP will review the records of those who apply for such advancement.

Unlike the regular promotional ladder, the Merit Step system is competitive. Thus it is unlikely that all qualified applicants will be granted step advancements in any given academic year, the number of merit step advancements being dependent upon budgetary allocations.

2.1 Merit Step Advancement: Standards

Merit Step Advancements shall be awarded in the areas of teaching, other professional accomplishments, or service to the College and/or District. Individual candidates may be considered for an award in any one of the three areas, though usually preference will go to those whose meritorious service has been in the area of teaching. Generally, an applicant may claim consideration for a merit step advancement for having produced something or having rendered some service of quality in addition to one's regular duties. An applicant also may claim consideration for having demonstrated obviously superior quality in the performance of his/her regular duties. Applicants must identify how meritorious performance was demonstrated in the year in which the application is being made and/or in the four years immediately preceding.

2.2 Merit Step Advancement: Application

An application for a Merit Step Advancement shall summarize all pertinent activities in any one or all of the areas specified above. The application shall not exceed five pages. The application shall be ~~accompanied~~ supported by appropriate documentation, and must include peer and student evaluations. During years in which a faculty member wants to apply for a Merit Step Advancement, he/she will have to notify in writing his/her School or Program Dean. The Dean shall then arrange for formal peer evaluation. The faculty applicant is responsible for contacting the campus Evaluation Coordinator to arrange for student evaluation. All evaluation done during that academic year will be considered "official" and thus subject to review.

All documentation and evaluations should be placed in individual faculty files retained in the Dean of Instruction's office or in another campus instructional office designated by the President. A designee of the President will maintain an "Access Log" for each faculty file to insure that confidentiality is guaranteed. Faculty files will be accessible only to: (a) the MSA applicant, (b) evaluation committee peers (including the Department Chair or his/her designee), (c) evaluation committee administrator (School or Program Dean), (d) the Dean of Instruction (or the Dean of Student Services when appropriate), (e) Faculty Senate MSA review committee members, and, (f) the College President.

On every occasion that a file is accessed, the log must be filled and signed. File material should be retained for three (3) years. After three years have elapsed, the faculty member should be notified that his/her file will be purged of dated material. The faculty member then may request the material, and may make arrangements to pick it up. If there is no response within ten days, all file material more than three years old should be destroyed.

The applicant shall submit his/her application to the ~~chair of the College review committee [See 2.3 below] by March 15~~ office of the appropriate School Dean by April 16, 1990 (February 15, beginning 1991) [See 2.3 below].

Effective February 15, 1991, only performance since the last Merit Step Advancement shall be considered for the faculty member who has received the award in a previous year.

2.3 Merit Step Advancement: Review

The Faculty Senate at each college will elect or appoint a committee of faculty of mixed rank to receive and review applications for Merit Step Advancement. These committees must be composed of faculty members who are not themselves applicants during the year(s) in which they serve. If the Faculty Senates so desire, they may assign these review duties to existing committees or to Department committees.

After considering applications and reviewing all supporting materials, the College committees shall forward their ranked MSA recommendations to the appropriate College President. All applications will be reviewed by the College committee and forwarded to the College President by no later than ~~April~~ June 15, 1990 (April 15, beginning in 1991).

The College President will review the applications and the College committee's recommendations, and will forward them, along with his/her recommendations, to the Committee on Academic Personnel. All materials shall be reviewed and forwarded by no later than ~~May 15~~ June 29, 1990 (May 1, beginning in 1991).

The CAP will review all the appropriate material, and will send a list of recommendations of individuals designated to receive merit step advancements to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for final action. The list shall be submitted no later than July 27, 1990 (June 15, beginning in 1991).

The Chancellor will notify the Personnel office of the names of faculty who have been awarded merit step advancements, and they will be notified of their awards in writing by the Personnel office no later than June 30.

3.0 TENURE AND PROMOTION: PROCEDURES

3.1 Probation and Tenure

(1) After meeting with the appropriate Chair and Dean, each newly-appointed faculty member, early in his/her first probationary semester, will be informed in writing as to what is expected of him/her during probationary service. The Dean and faculty member will select an evaluation committee consisting of one or two peers plus the Dean and the Department Chair or his/her designee. One of the peer evaluators must be a specialist in the subject area in which the evaluee teaches or in a subject area "reasonably related" to that in which the evaluee teaches. All peer evaluators must hold academic rank superior to that of the new faculty member. In the rare case where the new faculty member is appointed to the Professor rank, peer evaluators must hold this rank as well. Under special circumstances (shortages of qualified evaluators), tenured Assistant Professors may evaluate probationary Assistant Professors. The peer evaluators must be willing to serve. If there are no appropriate or willing faculty within the Department, the faculty member may suggest evaluators from other Departments, other campuses, or, if necessary, from outside the District. In such cases, the "outside" peer evaluator must be a subject-area specialist or a specialist in a subject area "reasonably related" to that in which the evaluee teaches. It will be the responsibility of each campus evaluation coordinator to make the arrangements for external evaluators and to provide training on the evaluation criteria and process.

(2) The first evaluation committee selected by the new faculty member will maintain its original composition throughout the probationary period, unless circumstances make this impossible.

(3) At the start of each subsequent academic year beyond the awarding of tenure, the faculty member will be asked by his/her Chair to submit again the names of two peer evaluators, and at that time the faculty member will have the right to change his/her peer selections.

(4) The Department Chair, or his/her designee, will serve automatically on each evaluation committee formed within his/her Department, except in cases where the Chair holds an academic rank equal or inferior to that of the faculty member being evaluated. In such instances, the Chair must designate a surrogate superior in rank to the evaluee, except in cases where the evaluee is a Professor.

(5) The appropriate Dean or Associate Dean will serve automatically on each evaluation committee formed within his/her School or administrative area.

(6) The subject matter specialist(s) shall have the major role(s) in evaluating the criterion of "Subject Matter Knowledge."

(7) After the evaluation committee has been formed but before any class visits are made, the entire committee shall meet with the evaluee to discuss the evaluation instrument and process. The committee may and should "tailor" the process and adapt the instrument to the specific circumstances and needs of the discipline and/or situation. In doing so, the committee may wish to delete inappropriate "examples of performance" and add others that may be more appropriate. The evaluation instrument, properly amended, then should be the formal document utilized to conduct the evaluation process. The Committee also should agree on how the five "areas of performance" listed on the "Faculty Appraisal Summary Sheet" ought to be prioritized and weighted. All of the various evaluation criteria should be in writing and should be distributed to all who participate in the process.

(8) The appropriate Dean, Chair, and peer(s) will each make at least two class visits per year during the probationary period.

(9) All official evaluation-related material should be placed in individual faculty files retained in the Dean of Instruction's office or in another campus instructional office designated by the President. Official evaluation-related material consists of the "Faculty Appraisal Summary" and "Comments and Suggestions" pages from the current "Evaluation Instrument." The file also must contain letters of appraisal from each evaluator (Please see 3.3 below), as well as the statistical profiles and the actual survey sheets taken from all student evaluations done during the probationary period. In addition, the file might contain any other information and/or documents the candidate and the evaluation committee agree are appropriate, provided they have bearing on his/her position as a faculty member. Any material submitted by the candidate must receive attention and comment from all evaluators.

A designee of the President will maintain an "Access Log" for each faculty file to insure that confidentiality is guaranteed. Faculty files will be accessible only to: (a) the probationary instructor, (b) evaluation committee peers (including the Department Chair or his/her designee), (c) evaluation committee administrator (School or Program Dean), (d) the Dean of Instruction (or the Dean of Student Services, when appropriate), and, (e) the College President.

On every occasion that a file is accessed, the log must be filled and signed. File material should be retained for three (3) years, or until the faculty member wins tenure (in future cases of fourth-year decisions). After the materials retention period has passed, the faculty member should be notified that his/her file will be purged of dated material. The faculty member then may request the material, and may make arrangements to pick it up. If there is no response within ten days, all file material more than three years old should be destroyed.

~~(9)~~(10) ~~During the probationary period, all evaluation materials and all documentary support will be retained within the Department, the School, or the Dean of Instruction's office, with the following exceptions: copies of the "Faculty Appraisal Summary" sheets, "Comments and Suggestions" pages, and the statistical profiles taken from the student evaluations shall be forwarded to the faculty member's official personnel file in Personnel Services.~~ If the candidate does not meet standards, he/she presumably will be terminated in accord with District procedures, Bargaining Representative review of due process protection, and state law. If the candidate meets standards, he/she will be advanced "in-step."

~~(10)~~(11) If the probationary faculty member should serve one full year at the top step of his/her rank but has yet to win tenure, he/she will remain at top step until a positive tenure decision has been made. At such time, the faculty member becomes eligible for promotion and the candidacy will be considered under the provisions outlined below.

3.2 Post-Tenure, Non-Promotional Evaluation

~~(11)~~(1) Following the awarding of tenure, evaluators will each make at least one class visit per year during those years in which the candidate is eligible for a regular promotion or during those years in which a faculty member has applied for a merit step advancement. Evaluators will meet in committee with the faculty member during every probationary year and at least once every three years thereafter. During years in which the candidate is not eligible for promotion, no class visits will be required as long as the faculty member has been evaluated once within the past three-year period; however, if remedial suggestions have been made in prior evaluations, the faculty member's progress toward reaching his/her developmental goals will be discussed in a meeting with the evaluation committee. Anytime weaknesses are observed, those weaknesses must be identified specifically and a constructive process must be established in order to assist faculty to meet expectations. Specific suggestions detailing what a faculty member needs to do to meet expectations must be identified in a timely fashion. If after one year, the evaluation committee agrees that remedial expectations have been met, the initial remediation report will not become part of the faculty member's official personnel file. If the evaluation committee decides that remedial expectations have not been met, the initial remediation report and the one-year "follow-up" report will become part of the faculty member's official personnel file, and he/she will be notified of such in a timely manner. The failure to meet remedial expectations by the time of the one-year "follow-up" report and the entering of that information in the faculty member's official personnel file shall be considered as an "unsatisfactory" evaluation. Under the terms of Article VIII, Section A4.2 of the Bargaining Agreement, an unsatisfactory evaluation will result in the faculty member's salary being "frozen" at his/her current step. As soon as remedial suggestions have been met (as certified by the appropriate Evaluation Committee), the faculty member will begin again to advance in step within rank, effective the first day of the next pay period.

3.3 Promotion - General Procedures

~~(12)~~(1) During years in which the faculty member is being evaluated for promotional purposes, all evaluation-related material should be placed in individual faculty files retained in the Dean of Instruction's office~~a formal file will be prepared in the appropriate Dean of Instruction's office~~ or in another campus instructional office designated by the President. All participating in that particular evaluation process will be aware that its purposes are summative and that their comments will be reviewed by the appropriate Faculty Senate committee, the Dean of Instruction, the College President, the CAP, and perhaps the Chancellor.

A designee of the President will maintain an "Access Log" for each faculty file to insure that confidentiality is guaranteed. Faculty files are accessible only to: (a) the instructor, (b) evaluation committee peers (including the Department Chair or his/her designee), (c) evaluation committee administrator (School or Program Dean), (d) the Dean of Instruction (or the Dean of Student Services, when appropriate), (e) Faculty Senate review committee members, and, (f) the College President.

On every occasion that a file is accessed, the log must be filled and signed. File material should be retained for three (3) years. After three years have elapsed, the faculty member should be notified that his/her file will be purged of dated material. The faculty member then may request the material, and may make arrangements to pick it up. If there is no response within ten days, all file material more than three years old should be destroyed.

~~(13) During years in which a faculty member wants to apply for a Merit Step Advancement, he/she will have to notify in writing his/her evaluation committee, the department chair, the School Dean, the appropriate Faculty Senate committee, the Dean of Instruction, the College President, and the CAP. All evaluation done during that academic year will be considered "official" and thus subject to review.~~

~~(14) Faculty scheduled for regular promotion or merit step advancement first will present their records to their evaluation committees via the campus Dean of Instruction's office.~~

~~(15)~~ (2) ~~After~~ As all class or worksite visits, student evaluations, and peer evaluations ~~have been~~ are being completed, the Dean of Instruction's office shall compile an evaluation file on the candidate. The file must contain "Faculty Appraisal Summary" and "Comments and Suggestions" pages from the current "Evaluation Instrument." The file also must contain letters of appraisal from each evaluator (Please see 3.3(3)-(8) below), as well as the statistical profiles and the actual survey sheets taken from all student evaluations done within the past three academic years. In addition, the file might contain the following information and/or documents, almost all of which should be submitted by the candidate to the Dean of Instruction's office or to another campus instructional office designated by the President:

(a) A list and brief description of all courses the candidate has taught within the past three years;

(b) Syllabi and all other course materials used within the past three years (this could include examples of examinations);

(c) The candidate's description of his/her teaching methods, along with an explanation of their appropriateness;

(d) The candidate's description of his/her grading practices:

(e) The candidate's description of curriculum development and teaching innovations implemented during the preceding three years;

(f) A complete list of all teaching materials (such as videos) that are not listed on the submitted syllabi;

(g) A complete list of all articles, books, papers, works, etc. produced by the candidate with dates;

(h) A complete list of paper presentations, guest lectures, etc. given by the candidate with dates;

(i) A list of professional conferences attended within the preceding three years;

(j) The candidate's description of College and District service as well as professional and public service;

(k) Outside evaluations when appropriate and when requested by the candidate;

(l) A list of awards, grants, honors, prizes, etc.;

(m) Summaries of the written comments extracted from all student evaluations done within the past three academic years;

(n) An updated vitae;

(o) A Self Evaluation and a personal statement by the candidate. On such a statement, a candidate may wish to explain institutional limitations on his/her activity (such as no funding for conference travel, no release time for professional improvement, etc.).

Any material submitted by the candidate must receive attention and comment from all evaluators.

~~(16)~~ (3) The ~~Department Chair~~ School Dean will then review the candidate's file and verify that it is complete. The ~~Chair~~ Dean shall also solicit letters of appraisal from the peer evaluator(s) and the Department Chair, and shall him/herself write a letter of evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for promotion.

N.B. Letters must adhere to the following standards regarding legitimate areas for comment, which are modeled after AB1725 guidelines regarding tenure decision criteria: All evaluators must make every attempt to insure that evaluations never will be used discriminatorialy against candidates by disallowing comments regarding race, ethnicity, sex, age, veteran status, religious and/or political beliefs, and lifestyle. Evaluation decisions cannot be based upon factors unrelated to performance of the faculty member's duties. Reviewers must strive to maintain objectivity, and to assure that decisions regarding tenure or promotion do not contravene established principles of academic freedom. Decisions cannot be based upon any political criteria, nor can they be made arbitrarily, capriciously, or unreasonably.

(4) Once an evaluee's file is complete, the School Dean will convene a meeting of the evaluation committee. At that meeting, committee members should agree upon summary ratings and comments and prepare the "Faculty Appraisal Summary" and "Comments and Suggestions" sheets referred to in 3.3(2) above.

~~(17)~~ (5) The School Dean then will convene a meeting of the evaluation committee and the candidate. Prior to that meeting, the candidate will have the opportunity to inspect the file. If the candidate then wishes to respond to anything that is in the file, he/she shall be granted a reasonable amount of time (generally ten working days) to do so. The response(s) will be included in the file.

~~(18)~~ (6) ~~The Department Chair~~ After the completion of the second evaluation committee meeting and the resolution of all matters pursuant to it, the School Dean will ~~forward the candidate's file to the School Dean~~ notify the Dean of Instruction of the evaluation committee's decisions. Such notification shall be in writing.

~~(19) The Dean shall consider all evidence in the file, write a letter of appraisal, and forward all to the Dean of Instruction.~~

~~(20)~~ (7) The Dean of Instruction ~~shall~~ may review the candidate's file and may comment on the candidate's abilities in a letter if he/she so desires. If the Dean of Instruction writes such a letter, it must be included in the candidate's file, and the candidate shall have the right to read the letter and respond to it under the provisions of Item 3.3(5) above. The ~~file~~ Dean of Instruction then will ~~be forwarded to~~ notify the appropriate Faculty Senate committee that the instructor under review is eligible for a promotion,.

~~(21)~~ (8) The Faculty Senate Committee shall review the candidate's file and then shall recommend either for or against promotion on the basis of a simple majority vote. The ~~file~~ committee then will ~~be~~ forward to the College President ~~along with the~~ its recommendations ~~of the Faculty Senate committee~~.

3.4 Promotion - Assistant to Associate Professor

~~(22)~~ (1) The College President ~~shall~~ may review the candidate's file, may comment on the candidate's abilities in a letter if he/she so desires, and then shall recommend either for or against promotion. If the College President writes a letter of appraisal, ~~it~~ must be included in the candidate's file, and the candidate shall have the ~~write~~ to read the letter and respond to it under the provisions of Item 3.3(5) above. If the promotion is to the rank of Associate Professor and the recommendations of both the Faculty Senate committee and the President are positive, promotion shall be granted without further review. If the recommendation of either the Senate committee or the President is negative, the faculty member in question may appeal the decision to the CAP.

3.5 Promotion - Associate to Professor

~~(23)~~ (1) If the promotion is to the rank of Professor, the decision, either positive or negative, must be reviewed by the CAP.

~~(24)~~ (2) In the appropriate circumstances described in 3.4.(1) and 3.5.(2), the ~~College President~~ Dean of Instruction's office shall forward the candidate's file to a confidential secretary to be assigned to the CAP on at least a part-time basis.

~~(25)~~ (3) ~~The CAP secretary shall make photocopies of the complete file for each CAP member and shall then deposit the original file in a secure depository.~~ The files ~~then~~ will be ~~sent out~~ available for examination to by each member of the CAP at a secure location to be provided by the CAP Chair.

~~(26)~~ (4) CAP members will individually review each file in a timely manner and will then meet in committee and again review and perhaps debate all evidence. They will maintain evaluator confidentiality throughout the review process. They will then decide either "yes" or "no" in all cases. All promotional denials will be explained in writing and made available to the candidate. There will be no numerical ranking of candidates for promotion. If necessary, CAP may request additional information from prior reviewers. All CAP decisions regarding promotion must be made only when the entire membership is present, and all decisions regarding promotion must be by a simple majority vote.

3.6 CAP Promotional Decisions

~~(27)~~ (1) CAP decisions regarding the denial of Associate Professor promotions will be final. Recommendations for Professorial promotion will be forwarded to the Chancellor who will review them and present them to the Board of Trustees for final action. In the cases of both merit step advancements and promotions in rank, if the CAP overturns the unanimous recommendations of the Senate Committee and the College President, that denial must be in writing and sent to the College President. If either the Chancellor or the Board recommends against any CAP-approved promotions, their reasons for doing so will be expressed in writing and will be made available to the ~~candidate~~ College President and the CAP.

~~(28)~~ (2) Throughout the entire process described ~~above~~ in Section 3, the candidate will have the right to talk with peer reviewers, chair, dean, and college president. He/she will have the right to see the letters of evaluation, and the Faculty Senate review committee will designate one of its members to provide such material upon written request.

~~(29) The timelines should be refined so that all evaluation, tenure, and promotion decisions will be finalized by June 30 of each academic year. In probationary cases, the timelines must assure review well in advance of the state mandated deadline.~~

3.7 Timelines

(1) Probationary Reviews:

Class visits and student evaluations completed by December 20.
All materials submitted and all Evaluation Committee meetings completed by January 31.
Notification of Evaluation Committee decision forwarded to Dean of Instruction by February 15.
Recommendation of action forwarded to College President by March 1.
All final tenure decisions must be made before March 15.

(2) Promotional Reviews:

Class visits and student evaluations completed by December 20.
All materials submitted and all Evaluation Committee meetings completed by January 31.
Notification of Evaluation Committee decision forwarded to Dean of Instruction by February 15.
Notification of promotional candidacy forwarded to appropriate Senate committee by March 1.
Recommendation of action forwarded to College President by March 31.
When appropriate, file forwarded to CAP by April 15.
When appropriate, candidates' names forwarded to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees by May 1.
All final promotional decisions must be made before June 1.

3.8 Notification of Promotion

(1) Candidates for promotion will be notified in writing by the Chancellor's ~~office or by such agency as he should designate~~ or his designee. Within ten working days after all such notifications have been made, a promotion list will be released.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
DEC 14 1990